DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 190 679 UD 020 066

AUTHOR Moulton, David M.
TITLE The Socioeconomic Status of Asian American Families in Five Major SMSAs: With Regard to the Relevance of Commonly-Used Indicators of Economic Welfare.
INSTITUTION Asian-American Service Inst. for Assistance to Neighborhoods, San Francisco, Calif.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 85p.: Paper prepared for the Conference on Pacific and Asian American Families and HEW-related Issues (Airlie, VA, March 9-12, 1978). Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans: Demography: *Economic Status: Educational Attainment: Employment Level: Employment Patterns: Income: *Measurement Techniques: Measures (Individuals): Poverty: *Quality of Life: Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS California (Los Angeles): California (San Francisco): Hawaii (Honolulu): Illinois (Chicago): New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This research examined the knowledge base on Pacific and Asian American families and assessed the impact of Federal programs and policies for this population. The thesis of the study was that conventional indicators used by the Federal government as measures of social welfare do not adequately depict the disadvantaged conditions under which many Asian Americans live, since Asian American families differ in many ways from those of other minority groups. Data was collected from Asian American families living in five standard metropolitan statistical areas (New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Honolulu, and San Francisco). Statistical analyses of the data demonstrated that alternative measures of social welfare give a less optimistic view of the situation of Asian Americans than do conventional measures. Findings indicated that Asian Americans work more and earn less when compared to whites. It was also found that Asian Americans do measurably less well than whites with comparable levels of education and effort. Recommendations for future research are presented and tables of data are included. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED190679

THE SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS OF ASIAN AMERICAN FAMILIES IN FIVE MAJOR SMSAS: WITH REGARD TO THE RELEVANCE OF COMMONLY-USED INDICATORS OF ECONOMIC WELFARE

David M. Moulton

1978

Prepared for the
Conference on Pacific and Asian American
Families and HEW-related Issues
Airlie, Virginia, March 9-12, 1978

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Harold T. Yee
ASIAN, Inc.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CD020066

ASIAN AMERICAN SERVICE INSTITUTE FOR ASSISTANCE TO NEIGHBORHOODS
ASIAN, inc.
• 1610 BUSH ST • SAN FRANCISCO, CA. 94109 • PH: (415) 928-5910 •

ASIAN, Inc.
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
1978

Gerald Chan - Chairperson
Zoilo Inacay - Vice Chairperson
Amey Aizawa - Secretary/Treasurer

Lina Block
Richard Cerbatos
Huali Chai
Lonnie Chin
Sam Ching
Ron Dizon
Steve Doi
Norman Lew
Eugene Louis
Robert Mah
Yone Satoda
Yori Wada

Contents

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Demographic structure of the Asian American population	
	Numbers and distribution	5
	Family characteristics	19
III.	Economic structure	
	Common measures of economic welfare	33
	Alternative considerations	36
	Income and labor force participation	38
	Occupational status	44
	Effects of education on income	49
IV	Poverty	
	Definitions of poverty	64
	Poverty characteristics	65
	Utilization of public assistance	69
V.	Conclusions and recommendations	75

TABLES

		Page
1.	Numbers and distribution of Asian Americans: immigrants and refugees	7-10
2.	Population, births, and deaths of Asians in California and Hawaii	13-15
3.	Estimates of Asian American population since 1970	17
4.	Characteristics of the Japanese population	20
5.	Characteristics of the Chinese population	21
6.	Characteristics of the Filipino population	22
7.	Characteristics of the Hawaiian and Korean population	23
8.	Characteristics of the non-Spanish White population	24-25
9.	Unemployment and family income	35
10.	Income and labor force participation, by SMSA	39-42
11.	Asian-owned businesses	46
12.	Low-status, low-income occupations	48
13.	Educational attainment and enrollment	50-51
14.	Educational attainment and earnings, across ethnic groups	53-55
15.	Returns to education, within ethnic groups	56-60
16.	White-Asian income differentials as a function of education	61
17.	Poverty status	66
18.	Low-income status	67
19.	Public assistance-poverty ratios	70
20.	Major social service programs	72

Foreword

This paper was prepared for the Conference on Pacific and Asian American Families and HEW-related Issues, which was intended to "examine the knowledge base on Pacific and Asian American families and to assess the impact of Federal programs and policies for this population." In this paper, socioeconomic data are examined quantitatively to elucidate the structure and condition of the Asian American family. HEW programs, especially those with a welfare orientation, are primarily redistributive efforts aimed at lightening the burdens on the disadvantaged. The eligible population is defined by a set of measures of economic welfare, of which the most widely used are family income, unemployment, female head of household, and educational level.

The thesis upon which this paper is based is that the Asian American family differs in many ways from the "typical" (white) American family and from those of the other minority groups - blacks, Hispanics, and Native Americans, which are more familiar to the framers of Federal policies. As a consequence, the conventional indicators, which are convenient and may be fairly accurate measures of welfare in these other population groups, do not adequately depict the disadvantaged conditions under which many Asians live. The paper demonstrates that alternative measures give a far less optimistic picture of the true situation - a picture which is experientially familiar to community members but is not statistically

documented. As long as the present indicators and the present approach are maintained by HEW (and other government agencies) the Asian population will continue to be underserved by Federal programs designed to aid the disadvantaged.

The Socioeconomic Status of Asian American Families in Five Major SMSAs

by
David M. Moulton*

I. INTRODUCTION

The "typical" American family is studied, measured, described, and analyzed in a myriad of reports every year. The "atypical" Asian American family is not covered in the overwhelming majority of such reports. A few statistical studies on Asian Americans have appeared recently. A Study of Selected Socioeconomic Characteristics of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census, volume II: Asian Americans, produced by the Office of Special Concerns, HEW, uses many of the same data sources as the present report, (Census and Immigration reports) and the point of view and conclusions are similar. That study, however, was concerned primarily with Asians in the aggregate across the United States. It will be argued below that Asians in Hawaii are very different from their mainland cousins and that there are important differences among mainland populations in different cities, depending greatly upon whether they consist mainly of recent immigrants or older populations. Economic Conditions of

---

*The author is a Social Science Analyst at ASIAN, Inc. He acknowledges the comments and assistance of Amado Cabezas, Harold Yee, Pauline Fong, and Sarah Jang, all of ASIAN, Inc.; and of Canta Pian, Division of Asian American Affairs, HEW, and Joy Quill, of the HEW Regional Office, Region IX.

Asian Americans by the Asian American Mental Health Research Center (AAMHRC Occasional Paper No. 3) uses the same sources plus a survey of Vietnamese refugees. Again, national data only were presented.

The Asian American Field Survey, also from the Office of Special Concerns, HEW, surveyed roughly 500 each of Chinese in New York; Japanese, Koreans, and Samoans in Los Angeles; and Filipinos in San Francisco in 1973. Although the survey was conducted to determine needs for health and welfare programs, a considerable amount of data on family structure and income was collected. Unfortunately for the purpose of the present paper, the sample was limited to low-income, high-ethnic density areas and thus does not give a picture of the complete population. For example. the Japanese in Los Angeles had in the survey area a median age of 50, whereas the entire Japanese population of that SMSA had a median age of 30 (men), 32 (women) in the 1970 Census (see Table 4).

Because of the different geographical coverage of these reports, they were not used extensively in the preparation of the present paper. However, the reader familiar with them will find very little in disagreement with their findings. In particular, they represent the only data for Vietnamese and Samoans, and add substantially to the understanding of the Korean population.

Of a quite different nature is the recently released study of Cabezas and Yee, of ASIAN, Inc.: Discriminatory Employment of Asian Americans: Private Industry in the San Francisco-Oakland SMSA (July 1977). This work, while primarily concerned with employment characteristics of Asians, yields valuable insights into the reasons for low incomes among Asian wage earners. Based primarily upon EEO-1 reports (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) for 1975, it provides newer data than the census for this SMSA. One drawback is that EEO-1 reports do not identify specific ethnicities. The findings of this report are many, but those of most interest here are the following: Asians tend to have a high labor force participation rate (especially the women) and low unemployment. However they are conspicuously clustered into particular industries and occupations. In general, they are in low-wage industries (restaurants, department stores, clothing, and miscellaneous retail; hotels and hospitals; banking and insurance) and, in these, in low-status occupations (food service workers--busboys, dishwashers; sales clerks; orderlies; clerical jobs-especially those not involving public contact.) In industries where they are employed as professionals (electronics, banking, etc.) they do not rise to managerial positions. They are not often employed as professionals in more "public" fields such as newspapers, airlines, broadcasting and entertainment. Though many Asian males (primarily Chinese and Japanese) hold managerial jobs, these are mainly as small business proprietors. They are excluded from sales jobs requiring "salesmanship" rather than merely punching a cash register. They are excluded from the

better blue-collar jobs such as skilled crafts, transport operatives, police and fire services, tending rather to be operatives only in sewing factories or service workers. From all of these the picture emerges of persons who are working hard but not receiving substantial rewards for their labors or attaining responsible positions. There are indications that the same is true for other mainland cities. These findings provide insights into the low individual earnings of Asians which will be detailed later in this report.

The present study will examine the situation of Asian families in the five areas of their greatest concentration in the United States, with particular reference to the "Welfare" part of Health, Education, and Welfare.

II. Demographic structure of the Asian American population

Numbers and distribution

Asians are concentrated in a relatively few areas of the country. According to the 1970 Census, approximately 87% of Hawaiians, 73% of Japanese, and 69% of Filipinos lived in California and Hawaii. Seventy-one percent of Chinese lived in those two states plus New York. Koreans were the only group showing an exception to this pattern, with less than 40% in California and the Honolulu SMSA (data were not given for the entire state of Hawaii). Fifty to sixty percent of the three major ethnicities are found in just five SMSAs (Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas) - Honolulu, Los Angeles, San Francisco, New York, and Chicago, and over 90% of the total are located in urban areas. By contrast, only 14% of all Americans live in these SMSAs, and more than 25% are non-urban. It is the intent of this paper to contrast the social and economic conditions of Asian American families with those of the dominant group (whites, not of Spanish origin) to which the majority of Americans belong. Since the geographical distribution of Asians is so different from that of "typical" Americans, the analysis will focus on these five SMSAs to make the normalization more valid. Asian Americans and whites living in each of these areas will be compared rather than using the entire nation as a standard since the many whites living in other areas nationwide would give an inaccurate picture of the relative position of the two groups.

Most of the demographic data presented here are taken from the published reports of the 1970 census, including the Summary Manpower Indicators prepared for the five SMSAs by the Department of Labor.[1/] In addition, special runs were made using the 2% Public Use Samples of Census data.[2/] Annual reports of the Immigration and Naturalization Service[3/] and various special reports furnished the remainder of the source material. Since the Census provided detailed data for only the three largest groups - Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos - much of the discussion is limited to these. For Hawaiians and Koreans, very little is available; for Vietnamese, Samoans, and others, there is practically nothing. The frequent omission of these groups in this paper is due solely to a lack of data.

Table 1 shows the numbers and distribution of Asian Americans according to census, immigration, alien address, and refugee resettlement reports. In addition, there are informal estimates of 20,000 - 40,000 Samoans in Southern California, primarily the Los Angeles SMSA.[4/] It can be seen from Table 1B

1/ U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1970: General Population Characteristics, Series PC(1)-B (by State)
Detailed Characteristics, Series PC(1)-D (by State)
Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, Final Report PC(2)-1G
U.S. Department of Labor, 1972:
Summary Manpower Indicators, by SMSA (from the Second and Fourth Count tapes of the 1970 Census)

2/ The author gratefully acknowledges the services of Mr. Robert Healey of the Computer Center, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratories, who programmed and ran these tabulations.

3/ Immigration and Naturalization Service: Annual Reports, 1971-1975

4/ Ramsay Shu and Adele Salamasina Satele, The Samoan Community in Southern California: Conditions and Needs. Chicago: Asian American Mental Health Research Center Occasional Paper No.2, 1977, p.7

TABLE 1A

Total Number of Asian Americans, by Ethnicity in 5 SMSAs
1970 Census (20% count)

Ethnicity	SMSA					
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland	U.S. Total
Japanese(1)	15,732	169,025	104,494	16,630	33,587	588,324
Chinese (1)	11,995	48,897	41,500	77,099	88,402	431,583
Filipino(1)	11,568	66,653	32,018	12,455	44,326	336,731
Hawaiian(2)	479	53,709	4,634	884	3,641	99,958
Korean (2)	2,936	8,058	8,650	5,097	2,657	65,510

Source: U.S. Census of Population, 1970: Final report PC(2)-IG: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States.
U.S. Department of Labor: Summary Manpower Indicators: Chicago, Honolulu, Los Angeles, New York, and San Francisco SMSAs.

(1) Other large concentrations: Japanese, San Diego SMSA, 16,177; Chinese, Boston SMSA, 12,157; Filipinos, San Diego SMSA, 15,069 (20% samples)

(2) Hawaiian and Korean figures are 20% sample for U.S.total.

TABLE 1B

Immigration, July 1, 1970 - June 30, 1975
to Cities of Over 100,000 Population in the SMSAs

Ethnicity	SMSA					
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland	U.S. Total
Japanese(3)	84	358	427	350	211	25,910
Chinese(4)	2,386	2,007	5,889	20,411	9,183	107,120
Filipino	11,030	9,437	13,204	9,611	15,244	153,254
Korean	4,596	4,282	10,528	7,977	2,177	112,493
Other(5)	196	40	283	326	74	40,969

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service: Annual Reports, 1971 - 1975.
(3) Japanese to cities in 1974 only; U.S. total (5 years) includes Ryukyu Islands
(4) Chinese: Hong Kong included for all years in U.S. total but to cities in 1975 only
(5) City totals: Thais in 1974 only. National totals include Burma (1971 only), Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam.

TABLE 1C

Alien Address Reports, January 1975

Nationality	State of residence and number of permanent residents				
	California	Hawaii	Illinois	New York	U.S. Total
Burma	941	11	169	323	2,076
Cambodia	30	--	2	13	106
China & Taiwan	40,084	2,301	4,852	30,441	113,894
Indonesia	1,031	50	116	362	2,589
Japan	25,762	12,611	1,991	3,857	66,234
Korea	24,832	4,334	7,234	10,348	95,863
Laos	15	11	5	10	117
Malaysia	435	56	85	310	1,626
Philippines	70,468	30,463	14,477	12,165	183,402
Singapore	334	31	21	241	918
Thailand	2,820	318	1,644	1,806	16,405
Vietnam	1,854	398	374	535	10,749
Pacific Islands(6)	2,855	1,635	33	64	6,710

Source: Immigration and Naturalization Service: Annual Reports
(6) Fiji, Nauru, New Guinea, U.S. administered territories, Tonga, Western Samoa

TABLE 1D

Refugees

As of September 1, 1977, 145,700 Southeast Asian refugees had been resettled in the United States. Of these, 140,774 had reported under the alien address program in January 1977, as shown below:

State	Ethnicity			
	Vietnamese	Cambodian	Laotian	rank (total no. of refugees)
California	31,255	1,612	1,355	1
Texas	10,889	402	710	2
Pennsylvania	6,329	228	271	3
Illinois	3,437	179	498	8
New York	3,475	188	366	9
Hawaii	1,837	19	539	18
All others	68,130	2,975	6,080	-
Total	125,352	5,603	9,819	-

Source: HEW Refugee Task Force - Report to the Congress, September 21, 1977

that immigration flows mainly to those areas where there are already substantial numbers of each community. If past trends can be extrapolated to the 1976-78 period, it is expected that there will have been an additional 15,000 Japanese (at a slowly declining annual rate), 75,000 Chinese (rising slightly), 95,000 Filipinos (steady) and 90,000 Koreans (rising to a plateau around 30,000-32,000 annually), entering the U.S. by June 1978. In August 1977 the U.S. Attorney General authorized the admission of 15,000 more Southeast Asian refugees, and the continued stream of "boat people" to Thailand, the Philippines, etc., may lead to further admissions. Thus, the Asian population of the United States is rapidly becoming both larger and more diversified in its make-up.

The continuing presence of over 100,000 American troops in Asia (principally Japan and South Korea) will undoubtedly remain a major source of immigration for women. Although there are no figures directed explicitly at this group, INS reports show how nearly 10,000 persons admitted as "wives of U.S. citizens" from these countries, the Philippines, and Thailand in 1975. For all immigrants from these countries, the number of women in the age range 20-29 exceeded the number of men in that age range by 8,400, or a ratio of 2.3 to 1.[5/] For women from China and India where there are no bases, no such distribution is observed.

Besides the persons who are tabulated as immigrants, there are many non-immigrant Asians admitted to the United States - over a million in 1975, of whom 80% were Japanese, mainly tour-

---

5/ Immigration and Naturalization Service: Annual Report, 1975, Table 6

ists.[6] Most, of course, return home, but between April 1970 and July 1975 approximately 20,300 Chinese, 14,900 Filipinos, 13,200 Koreans, and 7,700 Japanese entered the country as non-immigrants and had their status adjusted to immigrants later during this period.[7] (The exact numbers are not derivable from INS reports.) Most of these were tourists or students at the time of entry. These persons are not included as immigrants in Table 1B.

No accurate figures are available for the number of Asian Americans at the present time. However, the immigration records can be combined with the measured numbers of births and deaths in California[8] to produce yearly state totals, and from these, birth and death rates (Table 2). Numbers for Filipinos between 1970 and 1972 have been approximated for the births and deaths for "others" in that period. (Filipinos have been separately identified by the State Department of Health in these tabulations only since 1973.) The rates, in births/deaths per 1000, are calculated from population estimates which were made using immigration and vital statistics and assuming no net interstate migration. A number of assumptions and approximations have been made in this table so that the exact numbers must be viewed with caution.

Birth and death statistics for Hawaii have also been made available (Table 2B). Here there is a conceptual difficulty with the definition of ethnicities. The State Department of

---

6/ IBID, Table 17

7/ Approximate calculation by author of data from Immigration and Naturalization Service Annual Reports, 1971-75, Table 6B.

8/ Communication from the California State Department of Health

TABLE 2A

Births and deaths of Asian Americans in California, 1970-76
Approximate mid year population and birth and death rates

Group and Statistic	Year and number of persons or rate						
	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Japanese:							
births	2,841	2,753	2,497	2,825	2,682	2,705	2,826
deaths	916	976	972	983	974	1,027	964
population	214,157	217,819	221,718	225,741	229,614	233,156	236,726
birthrate	13.3	12.6	11.3	12.5	11.7	11.6	11.9
deathrate	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.1
Chinese:							
births	2,740	2,576	2,345	2,899	3,060	3,247	3,761
deaths	891	880	909	978	958	1,008	1,027
population	171,468	177,156	184,943	193,920	204,501	215,411	226,797
birthrate	16.0	14.5	12.7	14.9	15.0	15.1	16.6
deathrate	5.2	5.0	4.9	5.0	4.7	4.7	4.5
Filipino:							
births	(4,512)	(4,495)	(4,688)	3,877	4,790	4,992	5,417
deaths	(245)	(235)	(239)	214	212	279	350
population	142,236	155,625	170,311	186,208	203,813	221,828	240,779
birthrate	(23.9)	(23.6)	(23.9)	20.2	21.3	23.8	25.4
deathrate	(3.6)	(3.5)	(3.4)	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.2
Koreans:							
population	16,640	19,624	24,141	30,194	37,680	45,251	53,053

Source: Births and deaths from the Center for Health Statistics, California State Department of Health. Figures in parentheses for Filipinos, 1970-1972 are estimates.

Population estimated by author from 1970 Census figures, Immigration Annual reports, and the given births and deaths.

Birthrates and deathrates based on these population figures.

Birth and death rates are the number of events per 1000 population.
Korean population estimated using Chinese birthrates and Filipino deathrates (see text)

TABLE 2B

Births and deaths of Asian Americans in Hawaii, 1970 to 1976
Population and birth and death rates, 1970 and 1976

Group and Statistic	Year and number of persons or rate					
	1970	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Japanese:						
births	2,860	(2,451)	(2,371)	2,371	2,242	2,422
deaths	1,162	1,229	1,272	1,273	1,285	1,203
population	217,175					242,465
birthrate						10.7
deathrate						5.3
Chinese:						
births	515	(511)	(533)	573	567	614
deaths	224	252	277	248	267	305
population	52,583					48,449
birthrate						16.8
deathrate						8.3
Filipinos:						
births	2,507	(2,579)	(2,616)	2,692	2,753	2,792
deaths	576	623	615	543	598	598
population	95,680					112,913
birthrate						32.2
deathrate						6.9
Hawaiians:						
births	4,787	(3,210)	(3,299)	4,408	4,525	4,750
deaths	720	717	711	788	721	796
population	72,395					101,510
birthrate						31.4
deathrate						5.3
Koreans:						
births	144	(215)	(229)	199	215	193
deaths	69	54	59	66	57	59
population	8,914					13,309
birthrate						17.6
deathrate						5.4
Samoans:						
births	--	(343)	(330)	312	411	(395)
deaths	--	32	28	45	48	38
birthrate						87.1
deathrate						8.4

Source: State of Hawaii, Department of Health, Research and Statistics office.

Birth and death rates are the number of events per 1000 population.
See notes to this table on next page.

Notes to Table 2B (Hawaii)

Birth and death events are assigned to ethnicities according to pre-1950 Census rules. Populations are assigned according to current rules (self-association or ethnic group of father). An alternative definition (by the State Department of Health) gives the following 1976 populations:

	Japanese	Filipino	Chinese	Hawaiian	Part-Hawaiian	Korean	Samoan
Census	242,465	112,913	48,449	101,510		13,309	--
Dept.of Health	226,571	86,715	36,570	11,422	139,689	10,941	4,537

Births for the years 1972-1973 and for Samoans in 1976 are assigned according to the race of the mother. However, for all populations except Hawaiians and Koreans these are comparable with the births according to the race of the child, as given above, for the years 1974-76 when both sets of figures are tabulated. "Hawaiian" births and deaths are for Hawaiians and part-Hawaiians.

The birthrates for 1976 are based on the alternative (Department of Health) definition of population to be consistent with the definition of the race of the child.

Health categorizes ethnicities in various ways: population by the respondent's self-evaluation or race of the father, and births by the race of the child, or of either parent. It appears that persons with Hawaiian ancestry of any amount are listed as "part-Hawaiian" by the State of Hawaii. Certain state-sponsored programs are open only to persons of Hawaiian ancestry, so there may be an attempt to use definitions which maximize the numbers of such persons. (See the note to Table 2B.) At any rate, the Hawaii figures are used to corroborate the magnitudes of the California birth and death rates. For Japanese and for Chinese births, the values are fairly close. For Chinese and Filipino deaths the lower California rates are expected from the fact that the populations have more immigrants and tend to be younger. The higher Filipino birthrate in Hawaii probably reflects that group's low socioeconomic status.

Using the California birth and death rates shown, calculations may be made for the entire nation (Table 3). For Koreans, no figures are available, but consideration of the age structure and socioeconomic status of the population suggests a moderate birth rate and a low death rate. For this reason the birth rate for Chinese and the death rate for Filipinos have been arbitrarily applied to Koreans. Whereas more approximations are made in birth and death rates for Koreans and Filipinos than for the other ethnicities, it is precisely these latter two groups in which the effects of immigration totally overshadow the natural increase so that the errors from the approximation are less serious.

TABLE 3

Estimates of Asian American Population, U.S.A.,1970-76
Excludes temporary vistors

Group and Component	Year and number of persons						
	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976
Japanese:							
natural increase		5,121	4,576	4,674	4,949	4,747	4,927
immigration*		5,883	7,305	7,603	6,817	6,006	(5,600)
total	593,720	604,724	616,605	628,882	640,648	651,401	661,928
Chinese:							
natural increase		4,582	4,123	5,705	6,671	5,982	6,913
immigration*		18,335	24,856	27,165	28,394	28,652	(29,000)
total	440,726	463,643	492,622	525,492	560,557	595,191	631,104
Filipinos:							
natural increase		7,497	8,323	8,379	8,638	10,478	12,604
immigration*		29,345	32,061	34,524	36,895	35,371	(35,000)
total	352,765	389,607	429,991	472,894	518,427	564,276	611,880
Koreans:							
natural increase		882	954	1,267	1,756	2,076	2,663
immigration*		14,755	21,615	26,848	31,987	30,452	(31,000)
total	68,042	83,679	106,248	134,363	168,106	200,634	234,297

Source: initial population base: U.S. Census, 1970
immigration: Immigration annual reports
natural increase: California rates, by year and ethnicity, applied to the total population.

*"Immigration" includes aliens entering after April 1970 adjusted to immigrant status. 1976 immigration is estimated.
Total population is at midyear.

Tables 2 and 3 show similar trends. The Japanese population is growing, but rather slowly. Chinese are catching up, and Filipinos are catching up with both. In the 1976-77 period all three groups are expected to be about the same size- about 240,000 in California and 670,000 nationally. By 1980 the order will be reversed: Filipinos first, Chinese second, and Japanese third. At that point, the number of Koreans will be about what the Filipinos were in 1970. The birth rates in Table 2 indicate a slow natural increase for Japanese, a moderate increase for Chinese (slightly above U.S. totals in recent years) and extremely high rates for Filipinos - the highest of any racial group in California. (Birth rates for Hispanics are not available; however, there are indications from the 1970 census - the proportion of children under 6 - that they may be somewhat above those for Filipinos.) Birthrates for the three groups fell from 1970 to 1975, but there appears to have been a reversal of this in 1976, as with the total population of California. Deathrates are so remarkably low as to lead to the suspicion that they may have not been reported completely. However, there are large proportions of young people, especially among recent immigrants in the Chinese and Filipino populations, which could lower the death rates considerably.

Family Characteristics

Turning to the five SMSAs (Tables 4-7)we see more detailed characteristics for the Asian populations. For comparison, the non-Spanish white population is shown in Table 8. Unless otherwise specified, the data is from the 1970 census report "Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos." Population updates cannot be made since the Immigration and Naturalization Service figures show migration to cities of over 100,000 inhabitants only, and all of the SMSAs contain many smaller cities. In addition there is a likelihood of substantial intrastate migration, especially in California where there are several other major SMSAs directly adjacent to the Los Angeles and San Francisco-Oakland SMSAs. A number of special tabulations were made from the Public Use Sample Tapes of the 1970 Census: these are designated by an (S) in the margin. In these, only a 2% sample of the population was used, versus a 20% sample for most of the other figures. Thus all numbers in the special tabulations will be to the nearest 50. In these cases the sampling error may be quite large.

Two further facts should be kept in mind. First, the Census adopted the convention with regard to children of mixed heritage that the race of the child was considered to be the race of the father, unless otherwise specified. Similarly, families are classified by the race of the head, which is taken to be a male if present. Thus a family with a white husband and a Japanese wife, for example, would be considered a white family unless it were dissolved, at which point it would become a

TABLE 4
Selected Characteristics of the Japanese Population in 5 SMSAs, 1970

Characteristics	SMSA				
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles-Long Beach	New York	San Francisco-Oakland
Total persons	15,732	169,025	104,494	16,630	33,587
Under 18	4,492	52,164	31,246	3,935	8,807
Number of families	3,750	39,513	25,372	4,127	7,532
Husband-wife families	3,313	34,151	21,938	3,714	6,488
Female-headed families	284	3,510	2,361	207	804
Extended families (S)	450	5,300	3,200	300	1,000
Families with: children under 18	2,189	23,730	15,205	2,308	4,366
children under 6	904	9,658	6,532	1,555	1,918
Husbands with wives	3,353	36,266	22,368	3,729	6,586
wife of different race	535	2,766	1,714	584	769
Wives with husbands	4,116	39,638	24,987	4,299	8,900
Husband of different race	1,287*	6,118	4,448	1,122	3,078
Women with non-Asian husbands (S)	1,350*	1,950	3,350	900	2,900
number of children in such families (S)	2,600	2,600	4,700	1,300	3,200
Divorced, separated: men	266	2,448	1,765	566	589
women	340	3,924	2,692	429	996
Widowed: men	184	1,329	692	162	227
women	546	5,839	3,706	632	1,238
Unrelated individuals	1,832	9,868	10,682	3,342	4,869
Ratios of males to females	0.95	0.91	0.94	0.97	0.82
Median Age (S) M/F	34/36	27/30	30/32	31/33	30/31
Over 65	1,163	11,617	7,428	1,617	2,537
Foreign born	26.6	9.0	19.6	59.0	26.0

Note: Honolulu special tabulations (S) are for City of Honolulu only. For comparison, in the city there are 109,287 persons of Japanese ancestry, 25,970 families, and 3,161 wives with husbands of different race.
*The discrepancy between these two figures is due to the sampling error in the special tabulations.

TABLE 5
Selected Characteristics of the Chinese Population
in 5 SMSAs, 1970

Characteristics	SMSA				
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles-Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland
Total persons	11,995	48,897	41,500	77,099	88,402
Under 18	3,915	17,064	13,521	24,145	27,768
Number of families	2,589	11,448	9,141	17,593	19,650
Husband-wife families	2,393	9,668	8,079	15,777	17,170
Female-headed families	96	1,115	638	877	1,672
Extended families (S)	600	2,150	1,750	3,200	3,950
Families with:					
children under 18	1,723	6,863	5,779	10,898	11,833
children under 6	899	2,846	2,988	5,074	4,985
Husbands with wives	2,485	10,283	8,343	16,356	17,791
Wife of different race	245	2,958	1,054	1,124	1,008
Wives with husbands	2,437	10,034	8,124	15,640	17,646
Husband of different race	233	2,761	964	482	983
Women with non-Asian husbands (S)	150	350	400	400	600
number of children in such families(S)	250	300	500	250	750
Divorced, separated:					
men	297	932	953	3,027	2,260
women	234	1,048	818	1,281	1,548
Widowed: men	136	423	292	1,395	1,199
women	248	1,788	1,019	1,977	3,262
Unrelated individuals	1,448	2,468	5,035	8,600	9,514
Ratio of males to females	1.16	1.01	1.11	1.16	1.06
Median age (S) M/F	28/24	31/29	28/25	32/24	29/30
Over 65	663	3,880	1,893	5,440	6,688
Percent foreign born	56.7	11.3	50.7	64.9	46.8

Note: Honolulu special tabulations (S) are for city of Honolulu only
For comparison, in the city there are 36,517 persons of Chinese ancestry
8,684 families
1,583 wives with husbands of different race

TABLE 6
Selected Characteristics of the Filipino Population in 5 SMSAs, 1970

Characteristics	SMSA				
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles-Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland
Total persons	11,568	66,653	32,018	12,455	44,326
Under 18	3,030	28,116	10,455	2,940	15,741
Number of families	2,611	12,955	7,446	2,874	9,395
Husband-wife families	2,223	11,107	6,444	2,368	8,146
Female-headed families (S)	278	996	642	348	803
Extended families (S)	900	1,850	1,450	1,000	2,350
Families with:					
children under 18	1,500	9,249	4,681	1,542	6,218
children under 6	1,080	5,130	2,829	1,090	3,319
Husbands with wives	2,277	12,209	6,635	2,413	8,526
Wife of different race	620	3,423	2,150	895	1,736
Wives with husbands	2,186	10,821	6,043	2,004	8,180
Husband of different race	519	2,057	1,589	482	1,411
Women with non-Asian husbands (S)	300	350	950	300	1,200
number of children in such families (S)	300	700	1,300	250	2,300
Divorced, separated:					
Men	385	3,344	1,775	525	2,515
Women	319	1,904	1,001	448	1,492
Widowed: Men	63	914	207	128	334
Women	118	671	447	311	655
Unrelated individuals	2,584	5,946	4,707	3,217	4,934
Ratio of males to females	0.81	1.27	1.10	0.89	1.10
Median age (S) M/F	30/25	28/22	29/26	29/26	29/24
Over 65	465	3,707	1,865	868	2,688
Percent foreign born	74.8	34.0	60.1	69.3	64.7

Note: Honolulu special tabulations (S) are for city of Honolulu only
For comparison, in the city there are 29,073 persons of Filipino ancestry
5,713 families
893 wives with husbands of different race

TABLE 7
Selected Characteristics of the Hawaiian and Korean Populations, 1970

Characteristics	Hawaiians	Koreans		
	Honolulu SMSA	Honolulu SMSA	Los Angeles-Long Beach SMSA	New York SMSA
Total persons	55,175	8,914	8,811	4,925
Under 18 years old	25,036	3,348	2,816	1,568
Number of families	10,339	2,031	1,997	1,063
Husband-wife families	8,284	1,586	1,649	957
Female-headed families	1,480	371	250	55
Extended families (S)	1,500			
Families with:				
children under 18	7,191	1,364	1,251	708
children under 6	3,804	584	838	579
Women with non-Asian husbands (S)	600			
number of children in such families (S)	700			
Unrelated individuals*	3,378	635	1,012	737
Ratio of males to females	0.94	0.85	0.83	0.80
Median age (S) M/F	27/23			
Percent foreign born	0.2	21.0	61.5	62.7

Source of Tables 4-7
U.S. Census, 1970: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States
Special tabulations of the 2% Public Use Sample Tapes (designated by (S)).

Note: Ratio of males to females, for persons over 16 years old and over.
Honolulu special tabulations (S) are for city of Honolulu only.
For comparison, in the city there are 5,500 Hawaiian families (S)
2,350 Hawaiian unrelated individuals (S).

*Unrelated individuals estimated as 98% of the sum of (primary individuals + nonrelative of (family) head + non-inmates in group quarters)

Selected Characteristics of the Non-Spanish White Population
in 5 SMSAs, 1970

Characteristics	SMSA				
	Chicago	Honolulu	Los Angeles Long Beach	New York	San Francisco Oakland
Total persons	5,357,998	239,805	4,740,720	8,688,102	2,218,642
Under 18	1,717,535	81,633	1,324,058	2,413,930	612,549
Number of families	1,378,313	54,771	1,244,846	2,285,939	571,448
Female-headed	124,080	5,302	137,242	226,001	57,679
Extended families(S)	153,350	2,150	118,900	280,100	55,200
Families with children under18	730,046	34,695	616,532	1,104,840	284,246
Children under 6	336,343	18,225	261,345	481,298	123,019
Husbands with wives*	1,233,384	53,719	1,318,703	1,934,515	533,824
Wives with husbands*	1,240,452	51,590	1,134,036	1,975,681	532,334
Divorced,separated*					
men	80,010	9,392	152,860	108,610	69,016
women	108,557	7,660	223,563	149,983	92,447
Widowed* men	59,718	1,152	49,025	115,001	23,590
women	270,654	4,771	272,512	518,953	119,438
Unrelated individuals	489,475	45,377	683,310	913,387	352,267
Ratio of males to females	0.95	1.20	0.93	0.91	0.95
Median age(s): M/F	29/31	26/28	30/34	33/37	30/32
Over 65	541,111	9,182	549,281	1,125,009	247,441
Ratio of non-white Spanish to white	.003	.029	.013	.003	.020

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: General Population Characteristics.

California	PC(1) - B6
Hawaii	PC(1) - B13
Illinois	PC(1) - B15
New York	PC(1) - B34

Detailed Population Characteristics.

California	PC(1) - D6
Hawaii	PC(1) - D13
Illinois	PC(1) - D15
New York	PC(1) - D34

Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Summary Manpower Indicators

TABLE 8 (cont'd.)

Note: Honolulu special tabulations are for City of Honolulu only. For comparison, there are in the city 100,097 persons of non-Spanish white ancestry, and 26,943 families (Spanish-descent not removed). Most unfortunately, the 1970 Census did not place "race" and Spanish origin" on the same level in the Census questionaires so that confusion results in trying to distinguish "Anglo" white from total white, or Filipino from Spanish.

"Non-Spanish white" is derived for this paper by subtracting "Spanish" from "total white." A slight error is introduced since some "Spanish" are non-white. The Summary Manpower Indicators consider "Spanish American" to be the sum of "persons of Spanish language" and "persons of Spanish surname, not of Spanish language." Blacks, Native Americans, and Filipinos comprise most of these non-white "Spanish." Fortunately, the error is not large. The ratio of "non-white Spanish" to "total white" is shown above as a measure of the inaccuracy introduced by this approximation.

For the starred data (marital status), a lack of comparable data means that the report "Spanish Origin" (Census report PC (2) - 1C) is used for the correction. This definition gives numbers for Spanish Americans about 19% lower for Los Angeles, and 37% lower for San Francisco, than the "Spanish American" classification of the Summary Manpower Indicators. For Honolulu, "Spanish Origin" is not tabulated, and no correction is made for Spanish origin.

Japanese family if the wife retained custody of the children. The children would originally be considered white; after the separation they would probably be classified Japanese. On the other hand, if the husband were Japanese and the wife white, it would be a Japanese family. As mentioned previously and shown in the tables, the combination of non-Asian husband - Asian wife is more common than the reverse because of the presence of American troops in many parts of Asia. For this reason, tabulations have been made of the number of Asian women married to non-Asians, and of the numbers of children born to such couples. Second, the special tabulations for Honolulu were available for the city only, not the SMSA. A few comparisons of population size for this case are shown in the footnotes to the tables.

Using tables 4-7 we can obtain some information on the structure of Asian American families. Most Asians live in family units: on the average only about 10% are "unrelated individuals." This varies by ethnicity and location: about 6% of those in Honolulu are outside of families, while 22% of the Japanese and Filipinos in New York and Filipinos in Chicago are unrelated individuals. For whites, 9% are unrelated individuals in Chicago, 10-11% in New York and Los Angeles, and 16-19% in San Francisco and Honolulu. Most of the families have children: 56-60% for Japanese, 60-67% for Chinese, 63-67% for Koreans, and 70% for Hawaiians (in Honolulu). For Filipinos the ratios are more diverse: 54-57% in New York and Chicago (small middle-class populations) to 66-71% in San

Francisco and Honolulu (larger, working class groups). Among whites, the ratios are 48-53% except for Honolulu (63%). Fertility rates are not available for individual cities, but the California figures of Table 2 are consistent with the ranking of percentage with children: Filipinos, then Chinese, then Japanese.

Most families, not surprisingly, are husband-wife families: female-headed families are relatively rare, averaging under 10% of all families in most cases. (The major exceptions are 18% Koreans in Honolulu, 14% Hawaiians in Honolulu, 13% Koreans in Los Angeles, and 12% Filipinos in New York.) For Chinese the numbers of female-headed families are especially low. White families have a rather constant 9-11% of such families. Divorce and separation are likewise infrequent among Asians: in most cases, only 6-8% of all persons over 14 have broken marriages. In those instances where the numbers exceed 9% (Filipino males in all cities, Filipino females in Honolulu, New York, and San Francisco, and Chinese males in New York) The preponderant reason is "wife/or husband absent", suggesting a time lag in immigration where one spouse arrives first and later is able to bring over the other. For whites, the figures on divorce and separation are somewhat lower in Honolulu, Chicago, and New York (3-6%) and about the same in California (6-10%). It should be remembered that these are 1970 figures: it is felt by some that there has been an increase in divorces and separations among Asians since that time.

As expected from the greater longevity of females, widows outnumber widowers in all cases except for Filipinos in Hawaii. Here, the extraordinarily high ratio of males to females (5 to 4) reflects the pattern of immigration of male agricultural laborers in the '20's and '30's coupled with the greater tolerance of interracial marriage in Hawaii than on the mainland. Presumably, the typical married Filipino 30 years ago in Honolulu was a man with a non-Filipino wife. Because of past discriminatory immigration practices, high male/female ratios are also found among Filipinos in California and Chinese in all cities, but the low number of widowers makes it appear that the elderly males in these cases had not married. (In California, anti-miscegenation laws prevented marriages of Asians to whites.)

The extended family is traditional in the Asian root cultures. To see how much this persisted in the United States, an "extended family" was defined as any family containing related persons other than the spouse or children of the head. The percentages of such families varied considerably. Nearly 35% of Filipino families in New York and Chicago, and 25% in San Francisco, were so constituted ; however, in Honolulu, only 14% contained other persons. Chinese families showed a rather uniform level of 18-25% extended families in all cities. For Japanese the levels were lower: 7% in New York, 12-13% for the other mainland cities, and 20% in Honolulu. In contrast to Filipinos, both Chinese and Japanese had their highest levels of extended families in Honolulu. White families had rates of 9% in California and Honolulu, and 11-12% in Chicago and New York.

Intermarriage between Asians and members of other ethnic groups is of interest for two reasons. First, as mentioned above, the Census records the ethnicity of such persons according to the ethnicity of the father unless there is a definite statement to the contrary. Thus, many part-Asian persons are not counted in the official figures. Second, it is unclear to what extent persons of mixed ethnicity retain their ethnic identity. Persons with mixed Asian parentage appear to remain "Asian", but when the other parent is black or white there may be a tendency to assimilate into these larger groups. From Census data it is evident that there are great differences in the rates of intermarriage. Among Chinese, intermarriage rates are very low in the large communities of New York and San Francisco (3-7%), moderate in Los Angeles and Chicago (9-13%) and very high in Honolulu (28-29%). No pronounced differences between men and women are apparent. With Japanese, intermarriage rates are moderate for men (8-16%) but very high for women (15-35%), reflecting the "war bride" phenomenon superimposed upon the normal rate of intermarriage for mainland Japanese women. Not surprisingly, intermarriage is lowest in Honolulu and Los Angeles where the Japanese population is largest so that selection from within the community is easier. The greatest influx of Japanese war brides seems to have been to the San Francisco area, where there are proportionately the most Japanese women with non-Japanese husbands. Filipinos show extremely high rates of intermarriage for both men (20-37%) and women (17-26%). Cultural differences between Filipinos and the other Asian groups are

undoubtedly one of the reasons for this difference. In addition, at least two historical circumstances may have had an effect. The first was the arrival of young single Filipino men in the '20s and early '30s and the cutoff of further immigration in 1932 so that they could not be joined later by women: intermarriage with non-Filipinos, even when illegal, was then the only possibility for marriage at all. The second circumstance is, as mentioned earlier, military wives.

Special tabulations of the 1970 Census Public Use Samples were made of the number of wives with non-Asian husbands. This differs from the previous definition in that it excludes intermarriage among different Asian ethnicities, where any children would still be counted as Asian. A comparison between the two difinitions shows that most intermarriages in Honolulu involve other Asians rather than whites or blacks. To a lesser extent this occurs in Los Angeles, but is not very important in the other three cities. The approximate number of children from such families, who were presumably not counted as Asians in the Census, was 14,400 Japanese, 2,050 Chinese, and 4,850 Filipinos. (Note: these persons were not added to the population estimates made in this paper, and no corrections were made for intermarriages.)

The number of persons who were foreign born in 1970 gives some indication as to the makeup of the population. Japanese were overwhelmingly American born except in New York. Since the recent immigration of Japanese to New York is low (Table 1B) it would appear that many of these were Japanese nationals residing

semipermanently in the United States on business assignments.[9] For Chinese, about half were native born in 1970; for Filipinos and Koreans, about two-thirds, which is to be expected considering the recent immigration history of these groups. However, in Honolulu the percentage of foreign born is far lower for all Asian groups than on the mainland. This again reflects a historical pattern: there was early immigration to Hawaii to work on the plantations, but much lower rates of arrival in postwar years. Since Hawaii was not a state in these early days, the Asian exclusion regulations on immigration did not apply. With more equal sex ratios, many children were born, giving by the present time a predominantly native population. In 1970, Asians outnumbered whites by 3 to 2 in the state. Given these circumstances, it would be expected that Asians in Hawaii would not show the same social characteristics as those on the mainland.

9/ Foreign nationals appear to have been counted in the Census if they resided in the United States on Census day. The 1970 Census Users' Guide, Part 1, states "The total population of a geographic area recognized in census tabulations comprises all persons enumerated whose usual place of residence at time of census was determined to be in that area."

"Citizens of foreign countries temporarily visiting or traveling in the United States or living on the premises of an embassy, legation, etc. were not enumerated. Resident aliens were enumerated like other Americans." (Concept 50, Census Users' Dictionary, p.93) The 100% Census form, question 1, asks for persons "living here...or staying or visiting here and had no other home." Although this question is not addressed directly, it may be inferred that foreign nationals assigned to the United States for a period long enough to cause them to give up any previous residence (i.e., a period of years) would be counted. The 100% form does not ask about citizenship or immigration status.

The picture of Asian American families in 1970 that emerges from these figures shows a rather close-knit, male-headed family structure, frequently in an extended family, with few divorces or separations. Filipinos have the most children, then Chinese and Koreans, and finally Japanese. Intermarriages are common in Hawaii (usually within Asian groups) and everywhere for Japanese women (military wives) and Filipinos, both women and men. Japanese men and Chinese men and women intermarry rather infrequently. In Chicago and New York there are relatively greater proportions of Asians living alone or in childless families.

III. Economic Structure

Common measures of economic welfare

Asian families, we see, are socially stable. How do they fare in terms of economic well-being? There are two common indicators of economic welfare - employment (or unemployment) and family income. However, it wil be a principal thesis of this paper that neither of these indices is adequate to describe the true situation of Asian American families.

Conceptually, "economic welfare" can be defined as how successfully people are satisfying their economic needs - food, shelter, transportation, etc.* Welfare in this sense is difficult to measure since it is a conglomerate of various incommensurable factors. Accordingly, various partial indicators are taken to represent the whole concept. Such a procedure may be valid in comparing the welfare of different groups if the socioeconomic conditions under which such groups live are reasonably uniform. When these conditions are not the same, the indicators must be reexamined. Indicators optimized with respect to one type of behavior become suboptimal when applied to a group which behaves differently. It would be totally misleading, for example, to compare a family of inner-city renters with a farming family that owned its house and grew much of its own food on the basis of cash income alone. The differences between Asian and white Americans are much more subtle, yet they, too, cause the ordinary indicators to overstate Asian American welfare.

---

*The term "welfare" will be used in this sense; to refer to programs such as AFDC, food stamps, or social security we will use the term "public assistance."

Table 9A shows the two common measures of welfare for Asian Americans and the total population. For comparison, blacks have been added, since there is no argument that they are a seriously disadvantaged group. On this basis, it could be concluded that Asian Americans are rather well off. Indeed, such statistics have frequently been used to demonstrate that racial minorities can succeed in America (implying thereby that those who do not succeed are themselves to blame).

Further examination of these gross figures shows them to be misleading. Three major areas of concern are suggested. First, comparisons should be made with the "standard" population - the whites not of Hispanic origin (hereafter referred to as merely "white"). Other disadvantaged groups tend to lower the averages and thereby falsely inflate the status of Asians. Secondly, compariosns should be made within the same geographic regions. Costs of living vary substantially among different parts of the country and between urban and rural areas. It happens that most Asians are located in high-cost areas, especially those in Hawaii, whereas most other Americans live in areas where lower incomes are adequate. Finally, the common measures themselves do not adequately represent the economic expenditure patterns of Asian Americans.

The first two problems are rather well-known and can be disposed of by simply retabulating the figures: in Table 9B this is shown for family incomes. Now it can be seen that Chinese and Filipinos (except Chinese in Honolulu) are measurably less well off than whites. Hawaii is a special case:

Table 9A

Unemployment and family income for Asians, blacks, and U.S. total, 1969

Factor	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Black	U.S. Total
Unemployment rate, %:					
male	2.0	3.0	4.7	6.3	3.9
female	3.0	3.7	4.7	7.7	5.2
Median annual family income	$12,515	$10,610	$ 9,318	$ 6,063	$ 9,433

Table 9B

Median annual family income for 5 SMSAs, 1969

SMSA	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Black	White
Chicago	$13,478	$10,967	$11,734	$8,032	$12,957
Honolulu	14,222	14,437	10,083	6,741	10,909
Los Angeles	12,801	11,161	10,075	7,571	12,121
New York	12,375	8,136	11,725	7,309	12,663
San Francisco	12,045	10,045	10,122	7,964	12,752

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, U.S. Summary, Final Report PC(1)-D1 Summary Manpower Indicators

Median incomes for "White" calculated by the formula

$$Y = \frac{Y(aw) \times N(aw) - Y(s) \times N(s)}{N(aw) - N(s)},$$

where Y is median income and N is number of families. Subscript aw refers to all white and subscript s is for Spanish. This is not an exact expression for the median, but is a good approximation when $N(aw) >> N(s)$ and $Y(aw)$ is not greatly different from $Y(s)$.

Asians (collectively) are the majority group, with Japanese comprising (in 1976) 29% of the population. (Whites were 34%, but of these 6%, by Health Department definitions, would be mixed or part Hawaiian.) Many (10-15%) whites in Hawaii are in the military, and are therefore of rather low money income. Under these circumstances one would expect substantially different patterns of employment and income from the mainland where Asian Americans constitute at most 6% of any SMSA's population (San Francisco). For some other SMSAs, the differences are even more striking. In the San Diego SMSA, median family incomes are $9,935 for Japanese and $6,877 for Filipinos; in the Boston SMSA it is $8,591 for Chinese (and $7,069 for the City of Boston). Asian family incomes remain higher than those for blacks, but by considerably reduced margins except in Honolulu and the small professional communities of Filipinos in New York and Chicago.

Alternative considerations

Welfare, however, is not simply a matter of income. Items which do not produce a cash inflow may be of extreme value to their recipients. Leisure time (i.e., all time not spent in working) is universally recognized as an economic good. "Leisure" time, in this sense,may be spent in any of many valuable but non-paying activities: self-improvement, supervision of children, participation in public affairs, household maintenance or improvement, etc., and of course the necessities of life such as eating and sleeping adequately, as well as recreation

or relaxation from all of the above. Education is regarded in human capital theory as an investment for the sake of future earning - i.e., an activity engaged in because it will produce greater future returns. Because it wishes to invest in education, feels insecure, or faces a high price structure, a family may perceive its cash needs as rather high and devote extra efforts to increasing its income. Other productive activities are thereby forfeited for present earnings. Low individual earnings by family heads will also lead to the forfeiting of "leisure" by other family members who must work to maintain an overall income level. In these cases the total welfare of the family cannot be measured solely by its cash income, but must be discounted by the loss of other foregone opportunities. Application of these considerations to the situation of Asian families will further clarify their economic situation.

Family cash income is of course the total of dollars earned by all family members. A given income level may be the result of either high earnings by the family head or lower earnings by two or more persons. Three types of statistic are pertinent here. Median income per male worker is a measure of the earning power of male family heads. If median individual earnings are low, moderate family income can still result from multiple earners: the number of workers per family will show this, and will also give some indication of the family's subjective perception of its economic needs.

The earnings and labor force participation of women are another measure of family income structure. In the Asian

community (not in all other communities), where families tend to be intact and female-headed families are relatively uncommon, participation in the labor force by women indicates a perception of the need for greater income at the expense of child-rearing or other "domestic" duties. High income levels for women, paradoxically, are an indicator of low welfare: women from well-to-do families tend to work shorter hours and earn less because they do not need the money. Because of widespread past and present discrimination against all women workers, their earnings are far lower than those of men; thus the longer hours of work by poor women still do not raise their family income levels by substantial amounts.

Income and labor force participation

Table 10A-10D show some measures of these quantities. The incomes of Asian men are seen to be, on the whole, lower than those for white men, although for Japanese and Korean men in Chicago and New York the differences are not great. Reference to Table 4 shows a very high percentage of foreign-born Japanese in New York. Since immigration is low, it is likely that many of these are businessmen sent from Japan, who would not, of course, face the same difficulties in earning a living as permanent residents. At this point a comparison with the incomes of black men shows that Chinese and Filipino men are no better off in their earning power in the four mainland SMSAs. Such a finding should eliminate any doubt that Asians also constitute a disadvantaged population. The important exception to these

Table 10A

Measures of income and labor force participation for Asian and white Americans (1970 Census)

Median individual income - men over 16 with income

SMSA	median annual income, in dollars, by ethnic group						
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White	Black
Chicago	8,573	5,101	6,389	--	--	8,741	6,217
Honolulu	8,252	8,114	5,654	7,292	8,510	6,210	--
Los Angeles	7,890	5,916	5,448	--	6,512	8,138	5,752
New York	8,339	4,352	6,124	--	8,220	8,092	5,667
San Francisco	7,709	5,269	5,486	--	--	8,545	5,828

Source: U.S. Census, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States
Detailed Characteristics: PC(1)-D6: California
PC(1)-D13: Hawaii
PC(1)-D15: Illinois
PC(1)-D34: New York
Negro Population, Subject Report PC(2)-1B

Median income is for persons with income only.
"White" is calculated as $Ym = \frac{Ym(aw) \times N(aw) - Ym(s) \times N(s)}{N(aw) - N(s)}$

For whites, Ym = median income, males over 14
N = no. of persons in labor force
Subscript aw = all white, subscript s = Spanish

Table 10B

Measures of income and labor force participation for Asian and white Americans (1970 Census)

Labor force participation of women over 16

SMSA	Labor force participation rates, in percent, by ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White
Chicago	49.7	50.9	78.8	--	--	44.8
Honolulu	58.4	54.7	49.0	48.4	52.7	41.9
Los Angeles	53.3	51.4	63.1	--	50.3	43.7
New York	36.7	49.8	72.7	--	41.1	41.2
San Francisco	52.1	54.0	58.7	--	--	43.8

Source: U.S. Census: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States Summary Manpower Indicators

Table 10C

Measures of income and labor force participation for Asian and white Americans (1970 Census)

Median individual incomes - women over 16 with income

SMSA	median annual income in dollars, by ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White*
Chicago	3,915	3,012	5,361	--	--	3,068
Honolulu	3,788	3,632	3,034	3,157	3,448	3,151
Los Angeles	3,582	2,883	4,152	--	3,530	3,034
New York	3,962	3,143	5,950	--	4,371	3,174
San Francisco	3,687	2,575	3,635	--	--	3,403

Source: U.S. Census: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States Detailed Characteristics, series PC(1)-D

*White women - over 14

Table 10D

Measures of income and labor force participation for Asian and white Americans (1970 Census)

Number of workers per family

SMSA	Average number of workers per family by ethnic group				
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White
Chicago	1.8	1.8	2.0	--	1.7
Honolulu	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.2
Los Angeles	1.8	1.9	1.9	--	1.6
New York	1.3	1.8	1.6	--	1.6
San Francisco	1.8	1.9	1.9	--	1.6

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

generalizations is again Hawaii, where the very different ethnic makeup leads to substantially different patterns. Again it can be shown that incomes in other cities (Boston, San Diego) are extremely low for Asian men. As a consequence, Asian women work (Table 10B).

Labor force participation rates for Asian women are very high. The exceptional case - Japanese women in New York - is probably related to the peculiar age structure in this SMSA: 25% of all Japanese females there are in the prime child-rearing age of 25-34 years, while nationwide this group is only 14.2% of Japanese women. The labor force participation rate of Filipino women in Chicago and New York is remarkable. In this case, there are also many women in the age range 20-34 - but the majority of Filipino women are single and therefore, presumably, working. In the areas of family concentration - Honolulu, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, and New York for the Chinese, moderate to high female labor force participation is found.

As might be expected, incomes for Asian women are high relative to those for white women, especially for Filipinos (Table 10C). This latter observation is also in line with the apparent high number of single Filipino women, who will of course work full-time and thus earn well above the median for all women since that statistic includes many part-timers. A substantial number of Filipinas in these two cities are professionals, especially nurses, who will by the nature of their occupation receive moderately high salaries. In Honolulu, by contrast, Filipinas have the lowest earnings. Chinese women receive low pay despite their high labor-force participation.

This appears to be due to the employment of a very large number of these people in extremely low-paid occupations such as garment "sweatshops."

Table 10D necessarily follows from the previous three. Family incomes for Asians are moderate, yet pay per individual is low. Obviously, there must be more workers per family than for whites. Especially in Hawaii are the labor force participation rates high. The only exceptions occur for Japanese and Filipinos in New York, reflecting the higher educational levels and economic status of those communities. In mainland cities, the Japanese have slightly fewer workers per family than Chinese or Filipinos, but in Honolulu the situation is reversed.

Occupational status

The other common indicator of socioeconomic welfare - the rate of unemployment - also should be reconsidered. In this case, retabulation of the data by individual SMSAs does not change the situation greatly. Only Filipino males show any pattern of unemployment above whites. The point to be made here is that the social relations governing employment for Asians are substantially different from those for other groups. Asian American cultural values strongly encourage working and disapprove of unemployment. To avoid public shame, the unemployed person makes special efforts to locate a situation. Opportunities are often available, especially in areas of ethnic concentration: Chinatowns generally, and,

presumably, the Japanese and Korean sections of Los Angeles. This occurs because small business ownership is very high among Asians, except for Filipinos. Table 11A shows the number of Asian-owned business. Most of these are small firms, primarily in retailing, and many are ethnically identified or stereotyped (restaurants, gardening services, curio shops, etc.). This economic subsystem provides a source of employment for many Asians, In addition, there are particular industries, not necessarily Asian-owned, which hire large numbers of Asians. Examples are banks, hospitals, hotels, restaurants, and the garment manufacturing industry. Finally, it is often possible, especially with family financing, for persons to open their own businesses. (Lest it be thought that this is a path to riches, Table11A also shows average gross receipts for firms without employees. All costs of the business - cost of goods sold, rent, utilities, etc. - must be deducted before the proprietor can take his or her income.) Given the pressures to seek employment and the many job opportunities, particularly in ethnically-identified firms (Table 11B), it is not surprising that the Asian unemployment rate is low. Filipinos, with less access to community enterprise, show the highest rates of unemployment.

The other side of the coin, however is that these are often undesirable jobs.* Many are in services, such as waiters, busboys, dishwashers, janitors, maids, orderlies; operatives (sewing factory workers); or laborers (gardeners).

---

*Cf. Cabezas and Yee, op. cit.

Table 11A

Asian-owned businesses in 5 SMSAs, 1972

SMSA	number of firms	number of employees (excluding proprietor)	Average gross receipts (firms without employees)
Chicago	875	1,574	$17,000
Honolulu	6,755	18,907	$13,200
Los Angeles	7,403	7,814	$16,600
New York	2,119	1,210	$14,600
San Francisco	3.998	7,333	$23,600

Table 11B

SMSA	number of firms per 1000 population, by ethnicity					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipinos	Hawaiian	Korean	Undifferentiated
Chicago	--	--	--	--	--	20.5
Honolulu	26.4	26.0	9.0	5.0	19.2	--
Los Angeles	50.8	33.2	10.1	--	46.0	--
New York	10.8	23.3	4.8	--	15.9	--
San Francisco	36.5	27.0	7.4	--	22.2	--

Source: (data on firms): Bureau of the Census, Special Report MB72-3, Minority-Owned Businesses: Asian Americans, American Indians, and Others. (1972 Survey)
(population base): Summary Manpower Indicators (1970 Census)

Others are in low-level clerical jobs such as pool typists, file clerks, or keypunch operators, or sales clerks. Many higher-paid occupations such as police, firemen, skilled crafts, transport equipment operatives, salesmen or women (as opposed to mere sales clerks), and more responsible clerical jobs (secretaries) have relatively small numbers of Asian workers. Table 12 shows the percentage of each group in the low-paying,low-status occupations of laborers, service workers, private household workers, and farm workers. In most cases, a higher proportion of Asians than whites hold such jobs. For women, operative jobs are also included since, especially in New York, this is the main type of job available. Sewing factories, often described as "sweatshops", provide a low wage under often unpleasant working conditions. The sum of female low-status jobs and female operatives for Asian women exceeds that for whites in all cases except Filipinas in New York and Chicago, where the immigration of professional health workers results in a different picture. For men, only the Japanese in Chicago, Honolulu, and New York have a lower representation in low-status jobs than whites. Even here the figures may be misleading since the higher-status jobs of protective service workers (police, firemen) are included here. These account for 2.3%, 2.7%, and 3.3% of white males in Chicago, Honolulu, and New York, but presumably very much less for Asians.

Such information, coupled with the data on income and education in Tables 13-16, strongly indicates that the prob-

Table 12

Percentage of workers in low-status, low-income occupations (laborers, service workers, private household workers, farm workers; separately, female operatives)

SMSA	Ethnic group			
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	White
Chicago: male	9.6	34.0	15.5	13.1
female	12.2	17.4	7.2	13.3
female operatives	18.3	23.4	3.9	12.1
Honolulu: male	14.0	16.9	39.6	15.6
female	22.7	18.7	34.6	17.5
female operatives	10.0	8.2	16.6	2.2
Los Angeles: male	25.4	22.6	29.5	11.7
female	16.7	10.8	13.3	14.9
female operatives	16.6	25.6	13.0	8.2
New York: male	7.8	38.3	16.3	14.7
female	15.6	8.5	7.5	11.4
female operatives	7.4	43.7	3.4	10.1
San Francisco: male	26.9	27.2	43.5	13.1
female	26.1	14.0	22.5	14.1
female operatives	7.7	26.3	6.4	4.8

Source: U.S. Census, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States Summary Manpower Indicators

lem for Asians is underemployment, not unemployment. This condition is exhaustively documented for California by Cabezas and Yee (op.cit.) and by Wong[11/], where evidence for discriminatory hiring and assignment and low mobility is also presented. Thus the rate of unemployment is not an adequate index of the employment situation of Asian Americans.

Effects of education on income

One further factor needs to be considered. It has been a truism that education leads to better jobs and greater economic security. Perhaps nowhere has this been accepted more completely than among the Asian communities. Table 13 shows that, in general, Asians have had more years of formal education than whites and are, even so, continuing to seek education. (Again, Hawaii is the contrary example.) The extraordinarily high level of college education among Filipinos in Chicago and New York is a result of the migration of health and other professionals to those areas. Filipino women are somewhat better educated than Filipino men in all areas (Table 13B).

High mean levels of education do not tell the whole story. For Chinese and many Filipinos, there is a large group with very low educational attainment. Table 13D shows the existence of this group. In Hawaii, the fraction of poorly-educated whites is far below that of all Asian groups, while

---

11/ Harold H. Wong (thesis), The Relative Economic Status of Chinese, Japanese, Black, and White Men in California. Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley, 1974.

Table 13A

Educational attainment and enrollment for Asian Americans

Percent of persons 25 and over with
4 or more years of college education

SMSA	Ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White
Chicago	22.1	29.0	57.3	--	--	10.3
Honolulu	12.2	18.4	5.9	4.7	14.8	23.6
Los Angeles	16.0	28.8	30.4	--	36.7	18.6
New York	37.6	17.2	50.9	--	55.2	14.4
San Francisco	21.5	15.3	21.8	--	--	19.2

Table 13B

Percent of persons 25-34 years of age with
4 or more years of college education

SMSA		Ethnic group			
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	White
Chicago:	male	51.2	51.9	66.2	26.3
	female	28.5	38.6	71.3	16.5
Honolulu:	male	23.6	30.1	8.1	32.3*
	female	22.7	23.7	13.2	24.1*
Los Angeles:	male	34.5	52.9	33.4	25.9
	female	24.0	32.4	51.2	15.8
New York:	male	64.5	34.4	68.4	29.4
	female	35.3	22.2	70.6	20.1
San Francisco:	male	49.4	34.2	28.1	33.0
	female	28.3	22.9	36.5	24.1

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, Detailed Characteristics, Series PC(1)-D
Summary Manpower Indicators

*Includes black and Spanish-American: estimated to be less than 0.5% too high

Table 13C

Percent of persons 25-34 currently enrolled in school

SMSA	Ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White
Chicago	8.9	16.8	6.4	--	--	6.4
Honolulu	6.4	8.1	3.4	3.3	10.1	7.7
Los Angeles	12.4	19.0	8.9	--	17.9	10.7
New York	7.2	9.0	7.9	--	10.6	7.4
San Francisco	13.9	13.2	7.4	--	--	10.8

Table 13D

Percent of persons 25 and over with 8 or fewer years of schooling

SMSA	Ethnic group					
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	Korean	White
Chicago	10.8	33.4	8.4	--	--	24.4
Honolulu	23.4	22.8	45.9	24.6	19.0	9.6
Los Angeles	12.6	25.5	18.6	--	11.7	15.5
New York	13.9	46.9	17.7	--	13.4	26.9
San Francisco	13.0	39.7	27.6	--	--	14.5

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States, Detailed Characteristics, Series PC(1)-D

Summary Manpower Indicators

the fraction of college graduates is much higher. It may be speculated that Asians feel more secure in the multi-ethnic setting of Hawaii and therefore are not impelled to raise their educational level in order to compete effectively.

Asians expend a great deal of effort on improving their formal education in order to compensate for the mainstream experiences which they have been denied. This is done at a considerable sacrifice of time, money, and lost earnings. How well does the effort pay off? Tables 14-16 show the earnings of Asians and whites as a function of education. To remove the influence of students and first job holders or of retired persons, the tabulation has been limited to the age range of 25-59. The data is the same in all three tables, but is rearranged to show different structural relationships. The picture is now very clear: the returns to education for Asians are substantially below those for whites, except in Hawaii. The returns for Filipinos are practically nil. White males are ahead of Asians at all levels for the four mainland cities. There is a rather consistent pattern of a medium-sized income gap between Asians and whites at the lowest educational level, a narrowing of this gap at the intermediate (high school) level, and a widening again for college graduates - in most cases exceeding the original gap. The differentials are quite large. For Asian women versus white men, the income gap is large and fairly uniform at about $5,500 for the two lower educational levels, increasing sharply to over $7,000 for the college educated. Asians do gain by increased education, but not as much as whites. Most emphatically they do not catch up;

Table 14A

Educational attainment and earnings for Asian and white Americans

Persons with 4 or more years college education

SMSA		Median annual income in dollars: males/females				
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White
Chicago:	M	10,500	9,500	6,250	--	14,408
	F	7,500	6,000	6,300	--	6,788
Honolulu:	M	12,100	14,000	7,500	13,000	11,500
	F	8,250	4,750	6,000	5,500	5,750
Los Angeles:	M	12,889	11,000	6,875	--	14,311
	F	7,357	5,500	6,250	--	7,148
New York:	M	11,625	10,437	8,000	--	14,724
	F	9,000	7,375	7,429	--	7,820
San Francisco:	M	12,111	11,167	8,000	--	13,081
	F	6,000	6,300	5,167	--	6,902

Source (Tables 14-16): U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 14B

Educational attainment and earnings for Asian and white Americans

Persons with high school to 3 years college education

SMSA		Median annual income in dollars: males/females				
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White
Chicago:	M	9,333	6,500	7,250	--	10,904
	F	5,250	5,500	8,500	--	4,646
Honolulu:	M	9,700	10,778	6,000	8,833	8,875
	F	5,524	5,792	4,833	5,200	4,750
Los Angeles:	M	9,818	7,833	7,611	--	10,465
	F	5,196	4,333	4,250	--	5,167
New York:	M	6,500	6,571	8,500	--	10,449
	F	6,250	4,400	6,500	--	5,128
San Francisco:	M	9,500	8,881	6,750	--	10,687
	F	4,937	6,079	4,722	--	5,388

Source (Tables 14-16): U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 14C

Educational attainment and earnings for Asian and white Americans

Persons with less than high school education

SMSA		Median annual income in dollars: males/females				
		Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White
Chicago:	M	9,500	6,000	8,000	--	9,329
	F	4,000	3,375	5,500	--	4,250
Honolulu:	M	8,722	9,250	7,000	7,929	9,000
	F	4,077	4,273	3,500	3,437	4,000
Los Angeles:	M	7,458	5,000	4,900	--	8,766
	F	3,167	2,944	4,125	--	3,834
New York:	M	4,750	4,803	6,500	--	8,640
	F	4,000	3,588	6,250	--	3,819
San Francisco:	M	8,250	5,542	7,000	--	9,047
	F	4,250	2,950	3,417	--	4,056

Source (Tables 14-16): U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 15A

Returns to education for Japanese

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment			overall gain
		less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	
Chicago:	M	9,500	9,333	10,500	1,000
	F	4,000	5,250	7,500	3,500
Honolulu:	M	8,722	9,700	12,100	2,400
	F	4,077	5,524	8,250	4,173
Los Angeles:	M	7,458	9,818	12,889	5,431
	F	3,167	5,196	7,357	4,190
New York:	M	4,750	6,500	11,625	6,875
	F	4,000	6,250	9,000	5,000
San Francisco:	M	8,250	9,500	12,111	3,861
	F	4,250	4,937	6,000	1,750

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 15B

Returns to education for Chinese

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment: less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	overall gain
Chicago:	M	6,000	6,500	9,500	3,500
	F	3,375	5,500	6,000	2,625
Honolulu:	M	9,250	10,778	14,000	4,750
	F	4,273	5,792	4,750	477*
Los Angeles:	M	5,000	7,833	11,000	6,000
	F	2,944	4,333	5,500	2,556
New York:	M	4,803	6,571	10,437	5,634
	F	3,588	4,400	7,375	3,787
San Francisco:	M	5,542	8,881	11,167	5,625
	F	2,950	6,079	6,300	3,350

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

*maximum income at intermediate level

Table 15C

Returns to education for Filipinos

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment			overall gain
		less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	
Chicago:	M	8,000	7,250	6,250	-1,750*
	F	5,500	8,500	6,300	800*
Honolulu:	M	7,000	6,000	7,500	500*
	F	3,500	4,833	6,000	2,500
Los Angeles:	M	4,900	7,611	6,875	1,975*
	F	4,125	4,250	5,250	1,125
New York:	M	6,500	8,500	8,000	1,500*
	F	6,250	6,500	7,429	1,179
San Francisco:	M	7,000	6,750	8,000	1,000*
	F	3,417	4,722	5,167	1,750

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

*Note irregualr patterns with all of these.

Table 15D

Returns to education for Asians (all combined)

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment			overall gain
		less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	
Chicago:	M	6,611	8,437	9,222	2,611
	F	3,500	5,214	6,437	2,937
Honolulu:	M	8,104	9,483	11,500	3,396
	F	3,951	5,523	7,091	3,140
Los Angeles:	M	5,937	9,071	10,075	4,138
	F	3,367	4,824	6,357	2,990
New York:	M	4,886	8,700	10,562	5,676
	F	3,682	4,400	7,500	3,818
San Francisco:	M	6,362	8,675	10,844	4,482
	F	3,071	5,243	5,906	2,835

Source: U.S. Census, 1970: Public Use Sample Tapes, special tabulations

Tabulations are made for persons 25-59 years old.

Table 15E

Returns to education for whites (non-Spanish descent)

SMSA		median annual income by educational attainment			overall gain
		less than high school	high school-3 yrs college	4+years college	
Chicago:	M	9,329	10,904	14,408	5,079
	F	4,250	4,646	6,788	2,538
Honolulu:	M	9,000	8,875	11,500	2,500*
	F	4,000	4,750	5,750	1,750
Los Angeles:	M	8,766	10,465	14,311	5,545
	F	3,834	5,167	7,148	3,314
New York:	M	8,640	10,444	14,724	6,084
	F	3,819	5,128	7,820	4,001
San Francisco:	M	9,047	10,687	13,081	4,034
	F	4,056	5,388	6,902	2,846

Source: Public Use Sample Tapes, Special Tabulations (See Table 14A)

*minimum at midpoint

Table 16

White-Asian income differentials as a function of educational level: persons 25-59 years old

SMSA		Difference in median annual incomes in dollars: white male minus total Asian (male/female)		
		Educational level		
		less than high school	high school - 3 yrs college	4 + yrs. college
Chicago :	M	2,718	2,467	5,186
	F	5,829	5,690	7,971
Honolulu :	M	896	- 608	0
	F	5,049	3,352	4,409
Los Angeles:	M	2,829	1,394	4,236
	F	5,399	5,641	7,954
New York :	M	3,754	1,749	4,162
	F	4,958	5,393	7,224
San Francisco:	M	2,685	2,012	2,237
	F	5,976	5,444	7,175

Source: Public Use Sample Tapes, Special Tabulations (See Table 14A)

Negative numbers mean that Asians earn more than whites in this category.

in most cases, they fall behind. The return to the investment is not large.

The income status of Asian Americans is influenced by a number of cultural factors which are not pertinent for most other ethnic groups. Unemployment is low because many Asians are willing to take substandard menial jobs (dishwasher, busboy, chambermaid, seamstress) rather than fact the stigma of unemployment. Economic substructures exist where part-time work (without fringe benefits), sub-minimum wages, or piecework remuneration provide a downward flexibility in wages that allows for an increase in employment. In the mainstream, wages are inflexible downward so that unemployment results. Individual incomes are low: only the presence of multiple family workers makes it possible for a family to attain a reasonable (not high) income level. The returns to increased education are positive but low. The resulting picture of the economic status of Asian families is one where socioeconomic welfare is low not because of low total money income but rather because of lost leisure and delayed earnings. Even though the basic needs of food, clothing, and shelter are met, gross family income is not an accurate measure of welfare. Account needs to be taken of factors such as the number of family workers, the hours worked, and the other productive opportunities foregone. Asians apparently work harder to obtain less than do whites, with probably deleterious consequences on family cohesion and stability. The other large minority groups (blacks, Hispanics) seem to respond differently to discrimina-

tion. The patterns of deprivation which these groups exhibit are all too real, but should not be taken to be the only possible expression of disadvantaged status. Federal programs to alleviate disadvantage need to consider as well the alternative forms of behavior shown by Asian Americans.

IV. Poverty

Definitions of poverty

The above should not be taken to indicate that Asians are all above the poverty line. There are many poor Asians who must rely upon public assistance or do without the usual amenities of life. The number of such persons is dependent upon the definition of poverty. The "official" index of poverty, designed by Mollie Orshansky of the Social Security Administration, is based on the Department of Agriculture's economy food plan of 1961. This plan specified quantities of eleven food groups that constituted a nutritious diet at a minimum cost. The quantities varied by the age and sex of the recipients. Thus, a matrix was developed for the minimum food needs of families of different sizes and compositions. The plan reflected, to some extent, the actual patterns of consumption among low-income persons. In 1955, the date of the survey on consumption which served as the basis for the plan, the average family spent one-third of its income on food. Since the definition of necessary quantities of commodities other than food is highly subjective, the decision was made that poverty would be three times the cost of the economy food diet. This definition persists to the present, though the figures have been adjusted in light of changes in the cost of living. It is a compromise definition, attempting to provide an objective measure of poverty, but omitting a number of important issues.

Many of these omissions are made because data is not available: a prime example is that no allowance is made for geographical residence, whereas it is well-recognized that the cost of living varies in different sections of the country. Furthermore, the relative costs of food and non-food items vary. An alternative definition of poverty uses the low-level budget developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The BLS budget is based on a mixture of prescribed standards and empirically obtained expenditures without a solid conceptual framework and is produced separately for each of the major SMSAs. It is normally much higher than the Orshansky poverty index, and thus lies at the upper level of poverty.

Poverty characteristics

Tables 17-18 show the status of Asian and white families and unrelated individuals relative to these two poverty measures. Except for Chinese and Japanese families in Honolulu, the proportion of poor Asians equals or exceeds that of whites. Japanese show the lowest rate overall. (Here again the inclusion of other SMSAs would show higher figures: 6.2% in Denver, 8.4% in Fresno, and a remarkably high 21.6% in San Diego.)

There is considerable poverty among Chinese everywhere except Honolulu. It is highest in San Francisco and New York where there are large established Chinatowns.

Filipino poverty is rather high everywhere, but especially so in Honolulu: clearly there are very sharp differences among the ethnicities there which do not parallel those found on the

TABLE 17

Proportion of Asian and white families and individuals below the poverty level in 5 SMSAs, 1970

TABLE 17A

SMSA	Percent of families in poverty, by ethnic group			
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	White
Chicago	4.2	10.3	8.0	3.8
Honolulu	3.3	5.0	10.6	8.2
Los Angeles	5.1	8.8	9.8	5.3
New York	5.8	14.1	8.2	5.3
San Francisco	5.4	10.6	9.1	4.9

TABLE 17B

SMSA	Percent of unrelated individuals in poverty, by ethnic group			
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	White
Chicago	30.0	33.1	23.3	23.4
Honolulu	32.0	37.4	30.5	23.2
Los Angeles	28.0	36.8	28.4	22.7
New York	27.9	35.7	26.6	25.7
San Francisco	28.7	37.8	32.4	22.7

Source: U.S. Census, Japanese, Chinese, and Filipinos in the United States

Summary Manpower Indicators

TABLE 18

Proportion of Asian and white families and individuals below the BLS lower-level budget, 1970

TABLE 18A

SMSA	Percent of families below the budget, by ethnicity					BLS budget (4 persons)
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White	
Chicago	15.0	37.0	20.4	-	12.6	7500
Honolulu	17.3	21.1	32.8	28.7	26.6	8900
Los Angeles	17.0	23.4	30.3	-	17.1	7600
New York	19.0	44.7	19.4	-	16.7	7500
San Francisco	16.6	33.1	31.5	-	15.2	7900

TABLE 18B

SMSA	Percent of unrelated individuals below the BLS budget, by ethnicity					BLS budget (1 person)
	Japanese	Chinese	Filipino	Hawaiian	White	
Chicago	34.1	40.5	32.8	-	35.2	2700
Honolulu	47.4	43.9	47.6	51.1	39.4	3200
Los Angeles	32.6	40.8	39.7	-	37.4	2800
New York	36.8	39.5	32.4	-	36.5	2700
San Francisco	41.2	51.4	45.7	-	37.2	2900

Source: Public Use Sample Tapes, Special Tabulations

mainland. In Chicago and New York, where the small Filipino populations have a high number of professionals, poverty is somewhat lower but still far above the non-Hispanic whites. In the San Diego and Norfolk-Portsmouth (VA) SMSAs (not shown), where there are large naval installations, 22% of Filipino families are poor.

For unrelated individuals of all ethnicities everywhere the economic outlook is dim. "Poverty" is defined as an income (1969) of between $1752 and $1975, depending on age and sex. (This range is a consequence of the Orshansky definition: women and persons over 65 have lower nutritional requirements and thus the poverty limit is set lower.) With the exception of Filipinos in Chicago, however, unrelated Asians show a higher incidence of poverty than whites. Chinese are poorest everywhere; Japanese and Filipinos are roughly the same. Intercity variations are not so large here, reflecting a uniform condition of poverty for this group.

The official poverty level is extremely low. The 1970 BLS lower-level budget gives a more reasonable measure of low income (Table 18). For families of 2 persons, the poverty level is $2,469 - $2,766, (depending on the number of children), while for families of 4 they are $3,790 - $3,902 (male head under 65, non-farm). By contrast, the BLS levels derived for this report, rounded off for computational purposes, are $4,400 and $7,500 in Chicago, the lowest-cost of the five areas. Using this measure we see that from 15% to 45% of Asian families are at a low income. Japanese are tightly clustered between 15%

and 19%. Low-income Chinese are highest in Chicago, New York, and San Francisco. For Filipinos the usual pattern emerges: a lower proportion of low-income families in New York and Chicago than elsewhere. A higher percentage of Asian families than of whites is found in this category for all mainland cities. For unrelated individuals the BLS budget does not include many more persons than the poverty index. Again the pattern is fairly steady (30-50% along both ethnic and geographic lines. Use of the BLS budget rather than the poverty index does not lead to qualitative changes in the structure of the low-income population. What it shows is that, for families, this alternative measure places substantial numbers of Asian Americans in the low-income category. Two to four times more families lie between the two levels than lie below official poverty. Many Asian families, in other words, are only slightly above the poverty limits. By no stretch of the imagination can they be considered anything but economically badly off.

Utilization of public assistance

Asians who are poor often do not make use of the income supplements available. Table 19 shows the ratio of the number of families or persons who are receiving public assistance to those who are officially poor. For families the results are quite striking. Except for Honolulu, Asian families participate far less than whites in these supplementary programs. This remains true despite the wide variation by city. For

Table 19

Public assistance - poverty ratios for Asians and whites: 5 SMSAs, 1970

Table 19A

SMSA	Ratio, families receiving public assistance to families in poverty, by ethnicity			
	Japanese(s)	Chinese(s)	Filipino(s)	White
Chicago	*	*	.24	.44
Honolulu	.65	.44	.29	.33
Los Angeles	.43	.35	.69	1.02
New York	.42	.24	.42	.62
San Francisco	.86	.60	.64	1.04

Table 19B

SMSA	Ratio, unrelated individuals receiving public assistance to unrelated individuals in poverty			
	Japanese(s)	Chinese(s)	Filipino(s)	White
Chicago	1.00 (.59)	.24 (.61)	.08 (.17)	.11 (1.52)
Honolulu	.04 (.50)	.18 (.65)	.12 (.43)	.10 (.50)
Los Angeles	.12 (.65)	.22 (.31)	.09 (.50)	.37 (1.67)
New York	.28 (.83)	.22 (.59)	.12 (.24)	.18 (1.46)
San Francisco	* (.28)	.36 (.71)	.22 (.44)	.33 (1.43)

Source: Public Use Sample Tapes, Special Tabulations (Asians)
Summary Manpower Indicators (whites)

*No units receiving public assistance found in sample.
In Table 19B, the figures in parenthesis are the ratios for those receiving either public assistance or Social Security.

unrelated individuals the results are less clear. These figures, however, are clouded by the fact that many of the individuals are older persons receiving social security, which is not counted as public assistance. The inclusion of social security (figures in parentheses) shows whites to be far better off than Asians on this basis. The paucity of data precludes drawing conclusions relative to each specific ethnicity.

The reluctance of Asians to participate in public assistance programs is well known from other sources. For example, General Assistance surveys by the San Francisco Department of Social Services in July 1976 and January 1977 found 0.7% Asian clients in the latter survey and none at all in the former, despite an Asian population estimated at 20% and a poverty rate higher than the average for San Francisco at this time. Historical distrust of the government, perhaps a sense of self-reliance, and a reluctance to acknowledge publicly any economic failure seem to be the major contributors to the phenomenon. The unavailability of bilingual services may also be an important factor in some areas.

As the conclusion to this section, the social service programs of HEW may be briefly reviewed. There are nine major programs (each budgeted over $1 billion in Fiscal Year 1977). Table 20 lists these programs and their requirements for eligibility. For social security and medicare programs, age or disability and work credits are the only requirements. Some elderly Asians - either those who have immigrated re-

TABLE 20

Major Social Service Programs in the United States

Program name	Eligibility Requirements			
	aged	disabled	must be poor	other
Social Security	x			work credit
Survivors' Insurance				surviving dependents of social security recipients
Medicare (hospitalization)	x	x		
Social Security (disability)		x		
Medicaid	x	x	x	AFDC
AFDC			x	dependent children
Medicare (medical)	x	x		
Supplemental Security Income	x	x	x	maximum wealth limit
Social Services (Title XX)			x	AFDC, SSI

Source: 1976 Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance

cently or those who worked in industries not covered by Social Security - may lack the necessary work credits. However, there is no evidence at this time that the work credit requirement impinges differentially on Asian Americans in comparison with other groups. With these programs the principal danger is that Asians may not utilize them. Outreach and bilingual services would seem to be the needs in this area.

The other large programs - AFDC, SSI, Medicaid, and Title XX Social Services - all set limitations on family income and wealth for eligible applicants. Here it would be expected that Asians will be differentially excluded from participation. AFDC and SSI are direct income supplements for which such exclusion may be supportable. However, the Title XX and Medicaid programs, which provide other services, might well have their eligibility definitions expanded to cover the situations detailed earlier in this paper. There are a number of smaller social service programs (if a half-billion dollar program can be described as small) which appear to have a similar bias in their eligibility requirements. Among these may be listed Family Health Centers (for underseverved communities), Head Start and Follow Through (low-income children), the WIN program (childcare and support, and training for AFDC parents), Family Planning Services, ESEA Title I (educationally deprived children, the College Work-study Program, Direct Student Loans, the Trio program (Upward Bound, Talent Search, Special Services for Disadvantaged (high school and college students), the Teacher Corps, and, in general, any program providing services or as-

sistance preferentially to low-income families or communities. There are, of course, programs outside of HEW with this same focus: among them may be listed Food Stamps and other food programs, the domestic programs of ACTION, public housing, general assistance, Model Cities,and other community-development programs, and the Job Corps. When applications are made for grants under such programs for groups within the Asian community it often becomes necessary to propound detailed justifications for the inclusion of Asians as "disadvantaged" in order to qualify for assistance. More sophisticated indicators of disadvantage which take into account the special characteristics of the Asian family will help to rectify the imbalance in services provided at present to the Asian community.

V. Conclusions and Recommendations

What conclusions can be drawn from this study on the question of HEW, or other governmental,programs to serve Asian Americans? HEW programs are, in general, intended to serve disadvantaged populations. For the allocation of funds, particular statistical measures are used to determine eligibility. Unemployment and poverty are two of the most widely used of such indicators. However, as we have seen, neither captures very well the true condition of the Asian American family.

A greatly oversimplified picture of the reaction of minority groups to discrimination is this: Most minorities perceive that discrimination will prevent them from succeeding and drop out of the system. They develop low levels of skills and consequently experience difficulty in finding employment. Blacks, especially, frequently have broken families. The persons for this appear to be partly historical and partly a consequence of the regulations of the welfare system. Hispanic women enter the labor at a lower rate, both because of higher childbearing rates and cultural sactions. All of these groups are primarily employees in firms owned and managed by middle-class whites. These patterns are familiar to planners and are rightly taken account of in the design of programs. Among the consequences are high unemployment, low family income, low educational levels, and many broken families.

Asians, by contrast, display a quite different pattern. As a response to their disadvantaged condition they increase their efforts to gain an education. (This education, it might be added, is often in the wrong skills: it tends to be academically oriented with emphasis on mathematics or science. Effective communication and analytic thinking are frequently overlooked.) Employment is usually available, since, unlike the other minorities, small business ownership is commun among Japanese and Chinese, and there is a natural tendency to hire from within the community. In some areas, substandard wage scales are allowed to exist; many of these are elastic enough to allow adding more workers as long as the real wage keeps dropping. Furthermore, several family members work: wives, other relatives, children. Many workers at a low wage still bring family incomes to moderate levels.

Compared to whites, then, Asians work more and earn less. Even for persons with the same educational backgrounds Asians earn less. The measures of poverty do not capture the very real loss of economic welfare for the family which makes extraordinary sacrifices to send its children to college, and then sees those sons and daughters still treated unequally. HEW and other agencies need to broaden the definition of "disadvantaged" to include this situation. Although these are at best statistical simplifications excluding many individuals, it can be generalized that where other discriminated - against groups expend the same efforts as whites and earn less (or, from discouragement, reduce their effort and gain less still), Asians exert a higher level of effort than without fully catch-

ing up. While both the extra education and the higher degree of employment do have positive effects, Asians still do measurably less well than whites with comparable levels of education and effort. Their jobs are often menial or dead-ended (Cabezas and Yee, 1977). Paths of advancement are not open. Discriminatory practices, historical oppression, and a traditional emphasis on modesty and respect for others combine to maintain the Asian American family outside of - and below - mainstream America despite their otherwise excellent qualifications. A recognition of this subtle form of disadvantage by HEW officials will allow the development of policies and procedures to include Asian Americans in programs to alleviate the effects of generations of mistreatment by the majority population.

Recommendations for further study:

1. Construction of socioeconomic indicators appropriate for the Asian American population.
2. Characterization of the differences among Asian American groups.
3. Research on the education/work/income relationships for Asians.
4. Research on the motives for selecting career paths by Asians.
5. Research on educational policy for Asians, with regard to both optimum strategies and pertinent academic areas.

6. Study of family income, education, and expenditure patterns.
7. Determination of the cost of 100% participation by all eligible Asians in public assistance programs, and measurements of the benefits foregone at lower participation rates.
8. Determination of the public assistance costs if present conditions lead to the increased disintegration of Asian American families.
9. Outreach and education programs to Asians on their eligibility for public assistance benefits.
10. Investigation of cultural identification and acceptance for children with one Asian and one non-Asian parent.